



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,609	01/14/2004	Dwayne Nelson	IGT1P213/P000657-001	4809
79646 7590 11/25/2011 Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP - IGT Attn: IGT P.O. Box 70250 Oakland, CA 94612-0250			EXAMINER PINHEIRO, JASON PAUL	
			ART UNIT 3717	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/25/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@wavsip.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/757,609	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NELSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JASON PINHEIRO	<b>Art Unit</b> 3717	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 6,7,9-24,47-54,67-69 and 73-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 7, 9-24, 47-54, 67-69 and 73-76 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Applicant representative, during a phone call 09/08/2011, correctly pointed out that claims 75-76 were not properly rejected in the previous final office action. This office action is therefore in response to the amendments and arguments filed 05/19/2011.

This is a second Final action.

2. After the amendment filed on 05/19/2011, Claims 6, 19, 47, 51 and 73-74 were amended and claims 75-76 were newly added. As a result claims 6-7, 9-24, 47-54, 67-69 and 73-76 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-7, 9-13, 15-19, 22-24, 47-54, 67-69 and 73-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al (US 2003/0027639) in view of Walker et al (US 2003/0003988) and Eggleston et al (US 5771353).

Regarding claims 6 and 73-74: a casino gaming network (paragraph [0037]) (Fig. 1); a plurality of casino gaming servers, each casino gaming server configured to provide one or more downloadable casino games to casino gaming

Art Unit: 3717

machines via said casino gaming network (paragraph [0043]); a casino gaming machine comprising a display unit (14a, Fig. 4), a value input device (paragraph [0021]); and a controller (paragraph [0023]), wherein said controller is configured to: establish a communications connection with each casino gaming servers in said plurality of casino gaming servers (paragraph [0023]; paragraph [0056]), receive data representing server information regarding each casino gaming server of said plurality of casino gaming servers (paragraph [0023]; paragraph [0056]), said data representing server information regarding one or more of said downloadable casino games which each casino gaming server is configured to provide (paragraph [0023]; paragraph [0056]), select a selected casino gaming server from said plurality of casino gaming servers (paragraph [0023]; paragraph [0056]); transmit a signal to said selected casino gaming server requesting that one or more of said downloadable casino games be provided by said selected casino gaming server to said casino gaming machine over said casino gaming network (paragraph [0023]; paragraph [0056]), download said one or more of said downloadable casino games from said selected casino gaming server via said casino gaming network (paragraph [0023]; paragraph [0056]), initiate execution of one or more of said one or more downloadable casino games after said one or more downloadable casino games are downloaded (paragraph [0023]; paragraph [0056]), generate a game display of said one or more of said one or more downloadable casino games on said display (paragraph [0003]; paragraph [0023]). However, Peterson does not disclose that each casino

Art Unit: 3717

gaming server of said plurality of casino gaming servers is configured to initiate termination of said communications connection with said casino gaming machine, while said communication connection with said casino gaming machine still exists, if said signal requesting that one or more of said downloadable casino games be provided is not received by said each casino gaming server within a predetermined wait period. Further, Peterson does not disclose determining a value payout associated with an outcome of said one or more of said one or more downloadable casino games after receiving said one or more of said one or more downloadable casino games from said selected casino gaming server.

Eggleston discloses a server which is configured to terminate a communication connection with a client if a signal is not received by said server within a predetermined wait period, while said communication connection with said casino gaming machine still exists (Col. 6, Lines 57-64, the physical status of the communication connection still exists).

Walker '988 does disclose that the gaming device is programmed to determine a value payout associated with an outcome of said game (Paragraph [0047]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the well known the timeout feature of Eggleston into the invention of Peterson in order to yield the predictable result of creating a more secure gaming network, thereby protecting the information transmitted across the network, and further it would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 3717

skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the well known method of programming a controller to determine a value payout, as taught in Walker and, into the gaming device of Peterson in order to yield the predictable result of enticing players to play the game by offering payouts based on an outcome of the gaming device and by doing so players would want to play the game more often, thereby also increasing revenues for the game owners.

Regarding claim 7: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. However Peterson does not disclose that the display unit comprises a video display unit that is configured to generate video images.

Walker '988 does disclose that the display unit comprises a video display unit that is configured to generate video images (Paragraph [0047]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a video display as taught by Walker in the gaming device of Peterson in order to yield the predictable result of displaying video images and thereby creating a more appealing game for a player to play.

Regarding claim 9: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. However Peterson does not disclose that the display unit comprises at least one mechanical slot machine reel.

Walker '988 does disclose that the display unit comprises at least one mechanical slot machine reel (Paragraph [0047]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the mechanical slots as disclosed by Walker in

the gaming device of Peterson in order to yield the predictable and well known result of creating a mechanical slot machine.

Regarding claims 10 and 50-51: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses said controller is configured to generate a display relating to one or more of said plurality of casino gaming servers on said display unit, receive a selection from a person of one of said casino gaming servers from among said one or more casino gaming servers displayed on said display unit, and wherein said controller is configured to select said selected casino gaming server from said plurality of casino gaming servers responsive to receiving said selection (Paragraph [0056]).

Regarding claim 11: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses that said controller is further configured to cause said display unit to generate a display relating to data representing server information data regarding each casino gaming server of said plurality of casino gaming servers (Paragraph [0056]).

Regarding claims 12 and 52: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses that said controller is further configured to select said casino gaming server from said plurality of casino gaming servers based on said data representing server information regarding each casino gaming server of said plurality of casino gaming servers (Paragraph [0056]).

Regarding claims 13 and 53: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses that said data representing said server information regarding each casino gaming server of said plurality of casino gaming servers relates to at least one of the following factors for each casino gaming server of said plurality of casino gaming servers: data transfer rate, responsiveness, identification, load, geographic location, network subnet data, description, available gaming data and gaming data size (Paragraph [0056]).

Regarding claim 15: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses that said downloadable casino games relate to at least one of the following games: poker, blackjack, slots, keno or bingo (Paragraph [0003] & Paragraph [0023]).

Regarding claims 16 and 54: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses that said gaming data relates to at least one of the following: a new game, a software update for a game (Paragraph [0039]) and configuration data for a game (Paragraph [0019]).

Regarding claim 17: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses that said controller is further configured to generate said game display from said gaming data (Paragraph [0019]).

Regarding claim 18: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses a plurality of casino gaming



machines connected to said casino gaming network (paragraph [0023]; paragraph [0037])

Regarding claim 19: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses a master gaming server, wherein said controller is programmed to communicate with said master gaming server (Paragraph [0037]).

Regarding claim 22: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses that one or more of said casino gaming machines is a master gaming server (Paragraph [0037]), wherein said master gaming servers is configured to provide a list of said plurality of casino gaming servers to other casino gaming machines (Paragraph [0056]).

Regarding claim 23: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses that one or more of said plurality of casino gaming machines is a casino gaming server (Paragraph [0037]), wherein said controller of said one or more casino gaming machines is programmed to provide gaming data to other casino gaming machines (Paragraph [0016] & Paragraph [0054]).

Regarding claim 24: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses that said casino gaming machines are interconnected via the Internet (Paragraph [0040]).

Regarding claim 47: Peterson discloses providing server information data regarding a plurality of servers, the plurality of servers including either the server

Art Unit: 3717

gaming apparatus and one or more gaming servers and the server information data including comparative data for one or more server parameters of the server (Paragraph [0056]); receiving, by the client gaming apparatus, a selection, made according to the server information data, of a selected server from the plurality of servers, the selected server comprising the server gaming apparatus or one of the one or more gaming servers, the selection designating the selected server as a download source for gaming data for a game not available on said client game apparatus (Paragraph [0056]); sending a request message to the selected server requesting the gaming data (Paragraph [0023]); receiving the requested gaming data over the communications path from the selected server (Paragraph [0023]). However, Peterson does not disclose the server gaming apparatus is configured to initiate termination of said communication with the client gaming apparatus while said communications path with said client gaming apparatus still exists when the server gaming apparatus fails to receive the request message within a predetermined wait period. Further, Peterson does not disclose outputting of an outcome of a game of chance in accordance with the received gaming data responsive to the placement of a wager, or issuing a value payout for play of the game of chance.

Eggleston discloses a server which is configured to terminate a communication connection with a client if a signal is not received by said server within a predetermined wait period, while said communications path with said

client gaming apparatus still exists (Col. 6, Lines 57-64, the physical status of the communication connection still exists).

Walker discloses that responsive to playing of a player wager (Paragraph [0021]), causing output of an outcome of a game of chance in accordance with the received gaming data (Paragraph [0047]), and issuing a value payout for play of the game of chance (Paragraph [0047]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the well known the timeout feature of Eggleston into the invention of Peterson in order to yield the predictable result of creating a more secure gaming network, thereby protecting the information transmitted across the network, and further it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the well known method of programming a controller to determine a value payout, as taught in Walker and, into the gaming device of Peterson in order to yield the predictable result of enticing players to play the game by offering payouts based on an outcome of the gaming device and by doing so players would want to play the game more often, thereby also increasing revenues for the game owners.

Regarding claim 48: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. However Peterson does not disclose that the value payout is associated with the outcome of the game of chance.

Walker '988 does disclose that the value payout is associated with the outcome of the game of chance (paragraph [0047]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the well known method of programming a controller to determine a value payout associated with the outcome of a game of chance, as taught in Walker, into the gaming device of Peterson in order to yield the predictable result of determining an award to be provided to players dependent on the outcome and thereby creating a more exciting and appealing game, which would cause players' to want to play the game more often, thereby also increasing revenues for the game owners.

Regarding claim 49: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses receiving the server information data from a gaming apparatus selected from the group consisting of: the client apparatus, the server gaming apparatus, and a further gaming apparatus.

Regarding claims 67 and 68: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses that data includes a restriction which comprises availability of said downloadable casino game to said casino gaming machine and unavailability of said downloadable casino game to another casino gaming machine (paragraph [0019]).

Regarding claim 69: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Peterson further discloses that the server information data is obtained by a master gaming server from said plurality of casino gaming servers (paragraph [paragraph [0037]]).

Regarding claims 75 and 76: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. Eggleston further discloses prior to initiating termination of the communications connection, send an acknowledgement to the casino gaming machine indicating that the communication connection is to be terminated prior to initiating termination of the communication connection (Col. 5, Lines 6-31).

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al (US 2003/0027639) in view of Walker et al (US 2003/0003988) and Eggleston et al (US 5771353) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Grimm et al (US 6345297).

Regarding claim 14: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. However Peterson, Walker nor Eggleston disclose that said controller is further configured to remove a casino gaming server from said plurality of casino gaming servers as an option for selection based on a threshold value, said threshold value relating to at least one of the following factors: data transfer rate, responsiveness, load, geographic proximity, network subnet data, available gaming data and gaming data size.

Grimm '297 does disclose that said controller is configured to remove a casino gaming server from said plurality of casino gaming servers as an option for selection based on a threshold value (Col. 6, Lines 10-43), said threshold value relating to at least one of the following factors: data transfer rate,

Art Unit: 3717

responsiveness, load, geographic proximity, network subnet data, available gaming data and gaming data size (Col. 3, Lines 1-25).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Grimm into the combined teachings of Walker, Eggleston and Peterson in order to yield the predictable result of creating a more reliable server selection process and therefore a more reliable game apparatus.

6. Claims 20-21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al (US 2003/0027639) in view of Walker et al (US 2003/0003988) and Eggleston et al (US 5771353) as applied to claims 6, 18, and 19 above, and further in view of Crumby (US 6638170).

Regarding claim 20: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. However Peterson, Walker nor Eggleston disclose a network server, wherein said controller is further configured to provide said network server with a casino gaming machine identification and data to authenticate said casino gaming machine identification, receive a network identification from said network server if said network server accepts said gaming apparatus identification and said data to authenticate said casino gaming machine identification, and communicate with said master gaming server using said network identification.

Crumby '170 does disclose a network server (Col. 2, Lines 15-20), wherein said controller is programmed to provide said network server with a

Art Unit: 3717

gaming apparatus identification and data to authenticate said casino gaming machine identification, wherein said controller is programmed to receive a network identification from said network server if said network server accepts said casino gaming machine identification and said data to authenticate said casino gaming machine identification (Col. 6, Lines 10-46), and although Crumby does not disclose communicating with the master gaming server using the network identification, he does disclose using it to communicate with the network server and it would have been an obvious modification to do use the same network identification to communicate with the master server as well in order to create a more secure gaming network.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Crumby into the combined teachings of Walker, Eggleston and Peterson in order to yield the predictable result of creating a more reliable server selection process and therefore a more secure gaming network.

Regarding claim 21: Peterson, Eggleston and Walker disclose that which is discussed above. However Peterson, Walker nor Eggleston that said controller is further configured to receive network server authentication data from said network server, determine if said network server authentication data is authentic for said network server, and accept said network identification if said network server authentication data is authentic for said network server.

Crumby '170 does disclose that said controller is programmed to receive network server authentication data from said network server, determine if said network server authentication data is authentic for said network server, and accept said network identification if said network server authentication data is authentic for said network server (Col. 6, Lines 10-46).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Crumby into the combined teachings of Walker, Eggleston and Peterson in order to yield the predictable result of creating a more reliable server selection process and therefore a more secure gaming network.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Regarding applicant's arguments that Eggleston does not disclose that "each casino gaming server of said plurality of casino gaming servers is configured to initiate is configured to initiate termination...while said communications connection still exists" The Examiner must respectfully disagree. Eggleston discloses a server which is configured to terminate a communication connection with a client if a signal is not received by said server within a predetermined wait period (Col. 6, Lines 57-64), during which time the physical communication connection still exists.

8. In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the



Art Unit: 3717

claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). In this case, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the well known the timeout feature of Eggleston into the invention of Peterson in order to yield the predictable result of creating a more secure gaming network, thereby protecting the information transmitted across the network, it would do so by terminating a connection if a signal is not received within a period of time (i.e., preventing the server from sending out potentially sensitive information to a connection that may have been compromised), and further it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the well known method of programming a controller to determine a value payout, as taught in Walker and, into the gaming device of Peterson in order to yield the predictable result of enticing players to play the game by offering payouts based on an outcome of the gaming device and by doing so players would want to play the game more often, thereby also increasing revenues for the game owners.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 3717

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON PINHEIRO whose telephone number is (571)270-1350. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 7-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Melba Bumgarner can be reached on 571-272-4709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3717

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melba Bumgarner/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3717

/Jason Pinheiro/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3717